

to put it mildly—not at the arguments against such abuses by the Executive but at the fact that some Senators were only now waking up to the potential for such a power grab.

To those who now express concerns that the plenary powers of the Congress are under attack by this administration, I say that we have no one to blame but ourselves. The Congress inflicted this wound upon itself. We have plunged the knife into our own throats. It is our hands on the hilt of that knife.

I refer to the Congress' massively destabilizing decision to disrupt the balance of powers between the executive and legislative branches by granting fast-track trade negotiating authority to the President.

So many of the objections expressed last week in opposition to these free trade agreements have been raised before, time and time again on this Senate floor. Just last summer, they were raised by me, by our colleague Senator HOLLINGS, by our colleague Senator DORGAN, by our colleague Senator DAYTON, and others, warning of the abuse of Executive power we were inviting by handing over to the President the authority to regulate trade and international commerce.

We stood on this very floor and spoke to our colleagues, to the people in the galleries here and to the public across the land about what could be expected from the use of fast-track authority should such legislation be passed. We also spoke of the Constitutional ramifications of fast track. At the time, our expressions of concern apparently fell upon deaf ears.

Sixty-seven Senators, some of whom are now so urgently speaking in opposition to these free trade agreements pending before the Senate, voted to grant fast-track authority to the President.

I can pound my fist on my desk. I can shout with brass lungs. But, ultimately, it's not until it's too late, not until the Senate has been relegated to the sidelines, not until this Trojan horse has entered this sacred chamber that Senators begin to realize just what we have given away.

Shame on us!

This month, the administration submitted the free trade agreements it negotiated with the nations of Chile and Singapore. Included in those agreements are proposed changes to U.S. immigration and naturalization laws that would create what is effectively a permanent visa worker program for Chile and Singapore.

The trade agreements negotiated by the administration would unfairly lower the threshold for up to 1,400 Chileans and 5,400 Singaporeans to obtain American jobs. These foreign nationals could renew their worker visas indefinitely, year after year, with no limitation, while additional foreign workers enter the country to fill the annual numerical limitations for new visas.

Chilean and Singaporean nationals who enter the United States under

these agreements would effectively be exempted from prevailing wage laws. Even though employers must attest that foreign workers will be paid the prevailing industry wage and not displace U.S. workers, the Labor Department would be prohibited from investigating and certifying these attestations prior to the worker entering the country.

Further, the Congress would have no recourse to remedy any injustice, either by setting numerical caps or requiring a Labor Department certification, without violating the trade accord.

With 9.4 million Americans out of work, and an economy that has stalled for America's workers, the administration's immigration proposals are perhaps the most egregious that I have seen in some time. They are a direct threat to American workers who have already been hit hard by the Bush administration's economic policies. And now, what jobs the administration has not yet destroyed are being given away to foreign labor.

It is not even clear under what authority the administration is proposing to make these immigration changes. The Trade Promotion Act provides no specific authority to the United States Trade Representative to negotiate new visa categories or other changes to our immigration laws. The Congress has not granted the administration any such authority.

To the contrary, since the September 11 attacks, the Congress has passed legislation requiring the administration to tighten our border security and visa entry system—to plug the holes that were exploited by the September 11 hijackers. And now the administration is trying to open the system all over again.

I doubt that these immigration provisions could survive outside of the expedited procedures of fast track, subjected to thorough debate and amendment by the House and Senate. But that may explain why they are in these trade agreements in the first place. After all, a free trade agreement is not subject to amendment. It is not subject to a thorough debate. Any committee action is token, at best. The Congress must approve or reject the trade agreement in 90 legislative days.

These trade agreements and their immigration provisions may only be a first step in setting a precedent where the administration can use free-trade agreements not only to propose changes to immigration laws but to isolate all kinds of controversial legislation from the Congress. Perhaps next time the trade agreement submitted will include changes involving our military defenses or our international tax laws or our foreign aid budget.

The possibilities are frightening to imagine.

The late-Senator Daniel Patrick Moynihan was fond of saying that the U.S. Constitution does not assume virtue in its rulers. It assumes self-inter-

est. And it carefully balances the power by which one interest will offset another interest in order to protect against what James Madison called "the defect of better motives."

I am sure that many Senators who supported granting fast track authority to the President did so because of their support for this administration's free trade policies. But in pursuit of free trade, the Senate has given away its power to regulate trade and international commerce, and has flung itself into the abyss in which it now finds itself. If the Senate approves these treaties, the President, who is not the repository of all human wisdom, and is as vulnerable to "the defect of better motives" as any other mortal being, will have a free hand, without debate and without review, to dictate not only trade policy, but immigration policy as well.

The Framers of our Constitution would, I am certain, be appalled at how, time and time again, the modern-day Congress, under pressure from the White House political machine, yields its plenary powers to the executive.

We did it with fast track. We did it with the creation of the Homeland Security Department. We did it with respect to the war in Iraq.

The Senate has a duty to reject these trade agreements. Even those Senators who support the administration's trade policies must take a stand in support of something more important. The executive is, again, overreaching and the Senate must not, this time, acquiesce.

The Senate desperately needs to come to a better understanding and appreciation of our Constitution and the powers granted the Congress. It needs a better understanding of what exactly is at stake when we carelessly meddle with our system of checks and balances and the separation of powers. If we disregard the lessons learned from the colossal blunder of granting fast track authority to the President, we might just as well strike a match and hold that invaluable document to the flame.

We are entrusted with the safeguarding of the people's liberties. It is their Constitution. It is their Republic. It is their liberties that we have sworn to secure. If we continue to be careless or callous or complacent, it is their cherished freedoms that will go up in smoke.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

NOMINATION OF EARL LEROY YEAKEL III OF TEXAS TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the hour of 5:20 p.m. having arrived, the Senate will proceed to executive session for the consideration of Calendar No. 296, which the clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Earl Leroy Yeakel III of

Texas to be United States District Judge for the Western District of Texas.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, there will be 5 minutes for debate equally divided between the Senator from Texas, Mrs. HUTCHINSON, and the Senator from Texas, Mr. CORNYN, and 5 minutes for debate for the Senator from Vermont, Mr. LEAHY. Who yields time?

The Senator from Texas.

Mrs. HUTCHINSON. Mr. President, are we going to have back-to-back votes for Judge Cardone as well as Judge Yeakel, or do we talk about each judge before their individual votes?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There will be back-to-back votes.

Mrs. HUTCHINSON. Thank you, Mr. President.

Mr. President, I would like to speak on behalf of two Federal judge nominees for Texas. They are both for the Western District. Leroy Yeakel will sit in Austin; Kathleen Cardone will sit in El Paso, TX.

The Western District has the highest caseload of any district on the list of districts where judicial emergencies exist. It has been the No. 1 district in that regard. I am very pleased that we have two nominees to fill two benches in Austin and El Paso because we do need to be able to move these cases expeditiously. People are entitled to have their cases disposed of one way or another.

I am proud to speak for Lee Yeakel who has been nominated for the Austin vacancy. He has served as a justice of the Texas Third Court of Appeals in Austin since 1998. Prior to that, he spent 29 years in private practice in Austin, most recently as a partner with the firm of Clark, Thomas & Winthers.

Lee earned his bachelor's degree from the University of Texas at Austin in 1966 and his law degree from the University of Texas in 1969. He earned a master of law degree from the University of Virginia in 2001.

He is also very active in the community. He serves on the boards of the Austin Rotary Club, the West Austin Youth Association, the Austin Choral Union, and the Committee for Wild Basin Wilderness.

I am very proud to know Lee Yeakel. I have known him for years. I have also known his wonderful wife Anne and their family. I am very pleased that the President nominated Lee Yeakel after Senator CORNYN and I recommended him. I know he will be a hard worker, and I know he will be an independent judge, one who looks at the law and decides cases based on the law and not based on his personal opinions. So I am pleased to recommend him to the Senate.

Mr. President, I also recommend Kathleen Cardone for the judgeship in the Western District of Texas. She will be sitting in El Paso. Kathy is a New York native who graduated from the State University of New York at Bing-

hamton and St. Mary's School of Law in San Antonio.

After graduating from law school, Kathy clerked for a U.S. Magistrate for the Southern District of Texas, and then went into private practice.

She has the distinction of serving as the first judge for the 388th Judicial District Court, a new State court created in El Paso in 1999. She developed and founded the El Paso County Domestic Relations Office. This office serves as an intermediary between courts and litigants in family law matters. She also presided over the 383rd Judicial District Court in El Paso.

She has an excellent record of civic involvement. She is a member of the board of directors of the Upper Rio Grande Workforce Development Board and the El Paso Center for Family Violence. She is a past board member of the YWCA and the El Paso Holocaust Museum and Study Center. She has also been on the board of the El Paso Bar Foundation, the El Paso Mexican American Bar Association, and the Child Crisis Center of El Paso.

I think you can see that both of these nominees meet the high standards that we hold for Federal judges, both having been active in their communities and being well regarded by the bar.

I can say that both of these nominees were highly recommended by Democrats and Republicans and by their bar association membership. People who have worked with them recommend them highly, and I am very pleased with our nominations.

Thank you, Mr. President.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I rise today in support of the nomination of Justice Earl Leroy Yeakel to be a U.S. District Court Judge for the Western District of Texas.

Justice Yeakel has been a justice on the Texas Court of Appeals since 1998. For 29 years prior to his judicial service he was engaged in private practice, litigating both civil and criminal matters at the trial and appellate levels in state and federal courts.

While attending the University of Texas School of Law, he worked for the Austin law firm of Mitchell, Gilbert & McLean. Upon graduation in 1969, he remained at the firm as an associate counsel, participating in a broad range of litigation-related work. Five years later, Justice Yeakel started his own firm, where he remained until his departure in 1982. In the sixteen years that followed, he served as either an associate or partner in three prominent Austin law firms, litigating both civil and criminal matters at the trial and appellate level in state and federal courts.

Justice Yeakel has proven himself to be a distinguished legal scholar, author, practitioner and judge. He enjoys bi-partisan support and I am confident he will make an excellent federal judge. I commend President Bush for nominating Justice Yeakel and urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this nomination.

Mr. President, I am also in support of the nomination of Kathleen Cardone to be a U.S. District Court Judge for the Western District of Texas.

Since 1983, Judge Cardone has served as a state judge in El Paso County, TX, on numerous courts, including a municipal court, a family law court, and multiple state district courts. In addition to her judicial duties, she has worked as a trained mediator, as well as a teacher of an introductory law course at the El Paso Community College.

After graduating from St. Mary's School of Law in 1979, Judge Cardone worked for one year as a briefing attorney for Philip Schraub, a United States Magistrate Judge for the Southern District of Texas. Following this judicial clerkship, she entered private practice, handling an array of cases involving civil, criminal and family law matters.

Judge Cardone has proven herself to be a distinguished legal scholar, author, practitioner and judge. She enjoys bipartisan support and I am confident he will make an excellent federal judge. I commend President Bush for nominating Judge Cardone and urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this nomination.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, today the Senate will confirm another two judicial nominees, bringing the total number of judicial nominees sent by President Bush to be confirmed to 140. With today's vote, the number of judicial nominees confirmed this year alone climbs to 40. That exceeds the number of judges during all of 2000, 1999, and 1997, and is more than twice as many judges as were confirmed during the entire 1996 session. It is more than the average annual confirmations for the 6½ years the Republican majority controlled the pace of confirmations from 1995 through the first half of 2001. Thus, in the first 7 months of this year, we have already exceeded the year totals for 4 of the 6 years the Republican majority controlled the pace of President Clinton's judicial nominees and the Republican majority's yearly average.

Indeed with the confirmation of this 140th judge, the Senate has now confirmed in 2 years, from July 20, 2001 to July 28, 2003, more judges for President Bush than it was willing to consider during any 3-year period in which President Clinton's nominees were being considered by a Senate Republican majority.

A good way to see how much faster we are proceeding on judicial nominations for a Republican President than Republican Senators were willing to proceed for a Democratic President is to compare where we are on this date over the last several years. Over the last 6½ years of Republican control under President Clinton, the Republicans allowed only 20 judicial confirmations, on average, by July 28, and included only 4 circuit court nominees, on average, by this time. Today we will

have doubled those benchmarks with the confirmation of the 39th and 40th judicial nominees, which have included 10 circuit court judges. The double standard that Republicans have used in their treatment of judicial nominees is evident from this chart.

On this day, in 1995, only 32 judicial nominations had been confirmed; in 1996, only 14; in 1997, only 9; in 1998 the confirmations totaled 33; in 1999, only 9; and in 2000 the confirmation total by this point of the year was 35. Today, we confirm the 40th judge so far this year. Vacancies in the courts stand at less than half of what they were during the Clinton years and we have more Federal judges serving than ever before.

We have already this year confirmed 10 judges to the Courts of Appeals. This is more than were confirmed in all of 4 of the past 6 years when the Republicans were in the majority—in 1996, 1997, 1999, and 2000. And in the 2 other years, the Tenth Circuit nominee was not confirmed until much later in the year.

Today, the Senate confirms Earl Lee Yeakel and Kathleen Cardone to the U.S. District Court for the Western District of Texas. Judge Yeakel has been serving on the Texas Court of Appeals since 1998, appointed by then-Governor Bush. Judge Cardone has served as a State court judge on different courts throughout the El Paso area since 1990. Both were just nominated on May 1, their paperwork was not complete until June, and they are being confirmed just a month later. This is another sign of how fair the Democrats have been to this President's nominees.

The Judiciary Committee has already held hearings for 6 of President Bush's nominees for the Western District of Texas alone and for 13 of President Bush's district court nominees from the State of Texas. Eight of those judges were given hearings and confirmed during the 17 months I served as chairman of the Judiciary Committee. That was nearly one judge for Texas every other month, in addition to the four United States Attorneys and three United States Marshals who were reviewed and confirmed in that period of time.

As I have noted throughout the last 3 years, the Senate is able to move expeditiously when we have consensus nominees. Unfortunately, far too many of this President's nominees have records that raise serious concerns about whether they will be fair judges to all parties on all issues.

Mr. President, I reserve the remainder of my time.

How much time do I have remaining on this side?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Seven-teen seconds.

Mr. LEAHY. How much time is available to the other side?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Fifty-five seconds.

Mr. LEAHY. I yield back my time.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I would like to briefly respond to the remarks

of my democratic colleague on the state of the judicial nominations process.

We have heard a lot of statistics batted around about judicial confirmations. Some of them are accurate, some of them are dubious, but one of the more misleading ones I have heard is the claim that the score on President Bush's judicial nominees is 140 to 2. This is hardly the score.

First, there are more Federal appellate vacancies today, 18, during President Bush's third year in office, than there were at the end of former President Clinton's second year in office, 15. Almost one-third of President Bush's Federal court nominees have not been confirmed. There are 68 total vacancies on the Federal district and appellate benches, 32 of which are classified as judicial emergencies. We have worked to do, and we will continue to fill those vacancies. No raw number of confirmations means anything, in and of itself, while there are not one, but two filibusters of exemplary nominees going on now, potentially more to come, and emergency vacancies continued to exist. Are we supposed to be grateful that only a few of President Bush's nominees are being filibustered? Is there an acceptable filibuster percentage that the Democratic leadership has in mind? The mere fact that we have to ask these questions makes it crystal clear that we have a broken process. Even one filibuster of a judicial nominee is one too many.

As for the allegation that two nominees have been defeated, well, I for one would not be as quick as some of my Democratic colleagues to declare that the nominations of Miguel Estrada and Priscilla Owen have been defeated. We will continue to fight for the confirmation of these nominees and continue to file for cloture on their nominations. They are exemplary nominees who deserve to be confirmed.

And as for the implication that it is somehow acceptable to filibuster two judicial nominees in light of the others that have been confirmed, I must ask my Democratic colleagues who are leading these filibusters: Would you ever argue that it is permissible to break two criminal laws just as long as all the rest are being followed? Of course not. Nobody would make that argument any more than they would argue that it is permissible to disregard two of the constitutional amendments that comprise our Bill of Rights simply because there are eight others. The confirmation of other Bush judicial nominees in no way excuses or justifies the shabby treatment inflicted on Miguel Estrada and Priscilla Owen.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas.

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I join the senior Senator from Texas, Mrs. HUTCHISON, in commending to the Members of the body the nominations of Judge Lee Yeakel and Judge Kathleen Cardone. Both of these nominees are outstanding examples of the highly

qualified nominees that President Bush has sent to this body for consideration and confirmation. They deserve these appointments. I have every confidence they will serve with distinction. I am proud of what they represent and the potential they have as well.

In the couple seconds I have remaining, I would like to respond to the ranking member's statements about how many judicial nominees this body has confirmed of those who have been sent by President Bush. I commend him and this entire body for confirming the number of judicial nominees that we have. But, frankly, two unconstitutional filibusters is two too many.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's time has expired.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There is a sufficient second.

The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination of Earl Leroy Yeakel III, of Texas, to be United States District Judge for the Western District of Texas?

The clerk will call the roll.

Mr. MCCONNELL. I announce that the Senator from Kentucky (Mr. BUNNING) and the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. DOMENICI) are necessarily absent.

I further announce that if present and voting the Senator from Kentucky (Mr. BUNNING) would vote "yea".

Mr. REID. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. BINGAMAN), the Senator from New York (Mrs. CLINTON), the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. EDWARDS), the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. KERRY), the Senator from Louisiana (Ms. LANDRIEU), the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. LIEBERMAN), and the Senator from Michigan (Ms. STABENOW) are necessarily absent.

I further announce that if present and voting the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. KERRY) and the Senator from Michigan (Ms. STABENOW) would each vote "yea".

The PRESIDING OFFICER. (Mr. GRAHAM of South Carolina). Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 91, nays 0, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 307 Ex.]

YEAS—91

Akaka	Carper	Dorgan
Alexander	Chafee	Durbin
Allard	Chambliss	Ensign
Allen	Cochran	Enzi
Baucus	Coleman	Feingold
Bayh	Collins	Feinstein
Bennett	Conrad	Fitzgerald
Biden	Cornyn	Frist
Bond	Corzine	Graham (FL)
Boxer	Craig	Graham (SC)
Breaux	Crapo	Grassley
Brownback	Daschle	Gregg
Burns	Dayton	Hagel
Byrd	DeWine	Harkin
Campbell	Dodd	Hatch
Cantwell	Dole	Hollings

Hutchison	McConnell	Schumer
Inhofe	Mikulski	Sessions
Inouye	Miller	Shelby
Jeffords	Murkowski	Smith
Johnson	Murray	Snowe
Kennedy	Nelson (FL)	Specter
Kohl	Nelson (NE)	Stevens
Kyl	Nickles	Sununu
Lautenberg	Pryor	Talent
Leahy	Reed	Thomas
Levin	Reid	Voinovich
Lincoln	Roberts	Warner
Lott	Rockefeller	Wyden
Lugar	Santorum	
McCain	Sarbanes	

NOT VOTING—9

Bingaman	Domenici	Landrieu
Bunning	Edwards	Lieberman
Clinton	Kerry	Stabenow

The nomination was confirmed.

NOMINATION OF KATHLEEN CARDONE, OF TEXAS, TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the clerk will report Executive Calendar No. 304.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Kathleen Cardone, of Texas, to be United States District Judge for the Western District of Texas.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Shall the Senate advise and consent to the nomination?

The nomination was confirmed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the motion to reconsider is laid upon the table and the President will be immediately notified of the Senate's action.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will now return to legislative session.

The Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. ALEXANDER. I thank the Chair.

(The remarks of Mr. ALEXANDER pertaining to the introduction of S. 1474 are located in today's RECORD under "Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.")

ENERGY POLICY ACT OF 2003— Continued

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, what is the pending business before the Senate?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. We are on the Energy bill.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I have an amendment pending on the Energy bill which addresses an issue I think should have been the first title of this Energy bill. This is an amazing bill and there is a lot of work that has gone into it.

S. 14 is entitled, "A Bill to Enhance the Energy Security of the United States," an ambitious undertaking. I think it is appropriate we are now spending this time debating this amendment and many aspects of it be-

cause we all know that energy is essential to America's future, to our economy, and to our environment.

If we do not do our best in the U.S. Congress to work with this Government and establish the right incentives for the production of energy, as well as the appropriate regulation of the use of energy, then the American economy and future generations will suffer.

The reason I offered an amendment to this bill, I was presumptuous enough to believe there is an element that has not been addressed. As I read this bill, I found there was a terrible omission. This bill does not address one of the major uses of energy in America today. Most people, most families, most businesses equate the use of energy with the electricity they use in their home but certainly with transportation. How did you get to work this morning? How are you going to pick up the kids? What are you going to use over the weekend to go shopping? How are you planning vacation? Almost without exception, each of those decisions involves the application of energy.

One would think an Energy bill that looks to America's future would not overlook this important element: Transportation and the use of energy for transportation.

Let me show a chart that indicates the amount of energy used for transportation as opposed to other sectors in America. This chart addresses U.S. oil demand by sector. The blue portion of the chart, which is the largest portion, shows over 40 percent of oil usage by the year 2000. Forty percent was for transportation, another small portion of about 15 percent was for industrial, another portion for residential-commercial, and a much smaller amount for electric generation.

If concern is about the use of energy and the use of barrels of oil, naturally one would focus on this chart and say this bill clearly must address this. S. 14 must address how we are going to reduce our demand for oil for transportation.

The honest answer is, the bill does not. How can you have a thorough analysis and a good legislative program addressing energy and ignore the fact that out of the 20 million barrels of oil we use each day, many of them from overseas, over 40 percent of them are related to the transportation sector? This bill virtually ignores it.

It is not that the words aren't in here but that the words have no teeth. The words are simply statements, little notes that we send out into space, saying: Wouldn't the world be better if we had more fuel efficiency? Wouldn't it be better if we had more conservation?

If you believe in the tooth fairy and Santa Claus, you will believe that these little notes tossed out into space are all we need to do here—just to give a speech on the floor, put an idea in a bill and hope that America finds it and, if they do, that they become inspired and show leadership and show the initiative.

I don't think that is the way it works. It has not worked that way in the time I have served on Capitol Hill, nor in our history.

Let's take a look from the beginning here at what we are dealing with. The vast majority of oil reserves, of course, are in the Middle East. This is an indication that 677 billion barrels of oil can be found in the Middle East as compared to 77 billion in North America. As a consequence, it is very clear that if we are going to have an oil-driven economy, we are going to find ourselves spending more and more time focusing on the Middle East.

People say, turn to Russia, turn to the former Soviet Union. Of course, that is not a bad idea. But the estimated reserves of oil in the Soviet Union are 65 billion barrels. It is the Middle East which has all the action, 677 billion barrels of oil.

Yet, in 1999, the United States and Canada consumed 3 gallons of oil per capita per day whereas other industrialized nations consumed 1.3 gallons per day and the world average was a half gallon a day. So when it comes to the consumption of oil, the United States, of course, leads the world, with Canada, dramatically.

If you take a look at how that oil is then used, as I mentioned earlier, from this chart you will find that cars, SUVs, pickup trucks, and minivans account for 40 percent or more of U.S. oil consumption; the transportation sector overall, about 60 percent.

When you talk about energy and America's security, how can you ignore this? How can you put together a bill as lengthy as this bill—let's see how many pages we have here. It is hard work by a lot of staff people and Senators. There are 467 pages. How can you have a 467-page bill addressing America's energy security and fundamentally ignore needs for fuel efficiency and fuel economy and conservation to reduce the consumption of oil in the United States?

I asked that question last night at a press conference in Chicago, which I am honored to represent. I said: If we are talking about dealing with energy, how can we miss this? How can we ignore the efficiency of vehicles?

This morning, I attended a funeral for former State Representative John Houlihan, of Palos Heights, IL. Before that, I dropped in for a cup of coffee at a local Dominick's supermarket, and a woman I didn't know came up to me and said: I listened to you yesterday. You are absolutely right. We have to do something about the gas guzzlers and fuel economy in the United States of America. Otherwise, we are going to need foreign oil forever.

She understands. She is a case in point. I don't know exactly what is her background. She appeared to be a suburban mom. Suburban moms have really been used a lot in this debate. Those who say we should do nothing, let the fuel economy continue to deteriorate in the United States, use women like